DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 549 HE 003 674

AUTHOR Mattfield, Jacquelyn A.
TITLE Many Are Called, But Few Are Chosen.
PUB DATE 6 Oct 72
NOTE 7p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education (55th), October 6, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Chief Administrators; Females; *Higher Education; *Sex Discrimination; *Women Professors; *Womens Education

ABSTRACT

There are three general categories of administrators in the Ivy League and most other schools: (1) those who are employed to maintain and develop the physical plant, to manage the business operations, alumnae and other public relations, and development; (2) those who work in admissions, financial aid, student affairs, the academic and personal counseling of students, placement, and the registrars office; and (3) the academic leaders of the university such as the president, chancellors, provosts, and the deans of faculties, of colleges, graduate and professional schools, and special programs. Women have traditionally been held from the ranks of those who are hired for administrative positions in universities. However, the solution to this unequal practice is seen to be easily solved in all except the last of the administrative categories. This document reviews the past and present history related to women in administrative positions in the Ivy League Schools, and offers hopes for further equality of opportunity in such positions. (HS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 071549

"Women in Administration"
Panel Discussion # 10
9:00 - 11:00 a. m. Friday
October 6, 1972
American Council on Education
55th Annual Meeting

Many Are Called, But Few Are Chosen

Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld
Brown University

We use the term "administration" to cover persons serving a broad spectrum of functions within our colleges and universities. The qualifications expected of administrators, the manner in which administrators are selected and advanced vary widely from one area of administration to another, but the qualifications and manner of selection and advancement are strikingly similar among institutions of a kind.

Three general categories of administrators can be identified in the League of Ivy Schools and in most others. There is the category that includes those who are employed to maintain and develop the physical plant, to manage the business operations, alumnae and other public relations, and development. There is a second category composed of those who work in admissions, financial aid, student affairs, the academic and personal counseling of students, placement, and the registrar's office. The final group is comprised of the academic leaders of the university -- the president, chancellors, provosts, and the deans of faculties, of colleges, graduate and professional schools, and special programs. Hopefully, most of us here would agree that the intelligence, abilities, and personal qualities that make for successful service in <u>any</u> of these areas of administration are to be found in women as well as in men. How then are we to account for the persistent paucity of women in administration today? How and where can we expect to increase their numbers in the future?

HE 00 3674

The data I have collected on the administrators in the Ivy League Universities and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology show that the categories delineated above derive not only from the types of jobs and the responsibilities entailed, but from the qualifications traditionally set for admission to each of these categories. The data also indicate that the problem of the paucity of women in the

first two categories of administration is readily soluble -- that is, if the habits of discrimination and chauvinism can only be broken or weakened. The men hired for most of the openings in the first two areas, in business and in student services, have traditionally been recent college graduates or master's degree holders, personable, with good academic records -- men who want to remain in the university's environment. Many are alumni of the school, especially in the Ivies who share a happy certainty that alums make the best administrators by insuring the perpetuation and dissemination of a belief in the virtue of homogeneity of backgrounds and the unique character and excellence of the institution. There is in category two (student services) a subset, some of whose members stand somewhat apart from the group. These may be entitled Assistant or Associate Deans of Students or Student Affairs, Assistant or Associate Deans of "The College," or of "Studies" or of "Instruction;" tutors, house deans; or counselors. Their vitae may be and often are indistinguishable from those of the assistant or associates in other administrative offices, as just described; but a number of them will have moved from the ranks of lecturers, instructors, or assistant professors into administration. If they have come from a faculty, they are rarely prolific as writers or scholars before or after the move, although they are likely to have distinguished themselves as teachers, tutors, or departmental advisors of some sort, before having been refused tenure and offered a substitute post. Some choose to become administrators of this kind directly after receiving the Ph.D. or during work on a dissertation that may never be finished. A very few volunteer for part-time counseling or a temporary stint of deaning while continuing as highly regarded members of their departments simply because they 'like students' or are curious to challenge themselves in this kind of work. They are trained on the job by the superiors who have chosen them, and their salary increases are paced to their growing general usefulness in the office and competency in a relatively narrow specialization. There are plenty of qualified men for jobs in categories one and two, and for the subgroup in two. However, no college or university community boasts a shortage of intelligent women with college degrees and with other qualifications in every way comparable to those of the men being employed (except for the ties of the fraternity). Therefore, it seems probable that the goad of economic sanction will hasten both the consciousness and correction of practices prejudicial to women. When it does, the representation of women in all but the

top segment of the administration can increase immediately. Qualified women are available.

The rapidity with which even member institutions of the courteously resistant Ivy League have, under sustained pressure, found and employed women for such jobs in undergraduate and graduate administration bears out this assertion. At this time there are 41 women identified as administrators in category two as defined here. There are more than 120 men. A large proportion of these women work directly with students. This suggests that work directly involving students may be less prestigious and therefore considered more appropriate for women than other areas of administration, or that women are more drawn to it. Whatever the reason, three of the nine Ivy Leaugue schools when recently appointing women appointed them to serve as Dean of Students or Dean of Student Affairs. These three are the only women of the 41 identified as administrators and personally contacted for this study who both head major offices in the Ivy League and have un-prefixed titles. On the other hand, nineteen women are labeled assistant or associate deans and do counseling and advising for undergraduates primarily or exclusively; four have similar responsibility for graduate students; and four work in residence. The majority are instructed by the terms of their employment to have special concern for women students, and a few have their responsibilities limited to that cause. In other words, three quarters of the women working as administrators in the Ivy League during the current academic year are unambiguously working in student services. Like their male counterparts, many are alumnae. Like the man, they have attained various degrees from bachelor through doctorate in a wide range of subjects and have had employment in a variety of jobs before coming to this work. Like their male counterparts, too, only a few of these women will be promoted to positions of greater authority in their offices, and fewer still could meet the criteria tradition has established for transfer and promotion into the top arena of administration.

The situation for women in top administration is quite different than it is for women in student services. The primary officers of universities and colleges have customarily come from the faculties of the schools they govern or from the faculties of other institutions of comparable prestige -- and after

many years of teaching and research. They have for the most part been drawn from those disciplines to which the nation was turning for leadership or salvation in the year of their appointment.

Both of these prerequisites for office work against the employment of women in high academic posts. Although women have been admitted to the undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools of this country for over a century, only a small fraction have entered the professions and even fewer have remained active in them. Moreover, women are least well represented in the very fields which society has elevated in the recent past -- the sciences, economics, and now law. Whatever explanations social, economic, and political historians or behaviorists may give for the situation, the statistics are incontrovertible. Five years ago there were very few women in the regular faculty ranks of public or private, coeducational or all-male universities and colleges; and even the numbers in all-female colleges had dropped sharply. Today the situation is only slightly improved.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that as recently as 1970-71 there were virtually no women serving as officers in any coed or male institutions, and that as the proportion of women on the faculties of women's colleges plummeted, there was a parallel drop in the number and percentage of women at all levels of their administration, and most notibably in the highest levels of academic administration. (The exceptions to this rule were the "coordinate colleges" of the Ivy League, Barnard, Pembroke, Radcliffe, and the College of Liberal Arts for Women in the University of Pennsylvania, which had maintained autonomous administrative offices staffed entirely by women although instruction in all but one of them was provided by the faculty of the male college in joint classes. All but two of these have, of course, now been merged into the father institutions with various patterns of resignation, retirement and transfer of the original women administrators resulting.)

The popular view that academic excellence and prestige of an institution are directly proportional to the number of men in it and to the prevalence of their values, interests and concerns in all areas of its endeavors is pervasive in American higher education. But nowhere is it more obvious than in the Ivy League. Indeed, one notes regretfully that only the threat of economic retalia-

tion on the part of Federal government funding agencies was a force strong enough in many cases to initiate even apparent compliance with calls for a change in the status quo.

However, where there are presidents and governing boards sincerely committed to the inclusion of qualified women within all areas of their institutions they are hampered in fulfilling that commitment because there is not an extensive pool from which to select female candidates for top academic administration. This is in contrast to the ready availability of women with qualifications like those of men in other areas of administration -- in student services and in plant and business operation. In view of the traditions used by these universities for the selection of top administrators, there is truth in their contention that presently there exist few if any women in our country who are both moveable and who meet their time-honored criteria for presidencies, academic vice-presidencies, chancellorships, provostships, and even top deanships. Of the two ranking academic officers (presidents and provosts) in these nine institutions, eleven of the eighteen received their doctorates from an Ivy institution, and all but one have taught for many years in their university before becoming provost or president. (Only two of the eighteen have taught for fewer than ten years full-time.) Nine have their doctorates in the natural sciences (including psychology, math, and engineering); seven in economics and law; and one each in Sinology, History, and Urban Studies.

Given the reality that none of the graduate schools of these institutions but Brown has even 30% women students to enter the academic professions and that eight of the nine institutions last year had a combined total of only 151 tenured women in a total tenured faculty (professors and associate professors) of 4,470 and only 3 women as department chairmen or co-chairmen, there are overwhelming odds against finding senior women faculty with both the bent and the desire to enter academic administration after having arrived in the promised land of scholarly recognition in any of these institutions.

Under these circumstances, most of the Ivy institutions, pressed to appoint women to "high level" positions, have temporized. One to be sure has appointed a woman to be Dean of the Undergraduate College and Associate Provost. But this is the exception that proves the rule. The others have used familiar titles to designate positions dealing with matters that directly affect women (such as coeducation, affirmative action, recruitment of women faculty and the well-being of women students), or dealing with new areas of university activity such as continuing education, off-campus study, inter-institutional arrangements, and training programs in the health professions. In 1972-73 these women account for: one part-time president of the remnant of a coordinate college, four special assistants to presidents, one vice president, two assistant vice presidents, one associate provost, one assistant dean of the faculty, one assistant dean of a college of liberal arts and sciences. They average nine months in their positions and six of the eleven have been appointed only this current fiscal year. None of their jobs threaten the established hierarchies or territories, and more than half have the ultimate in protection -- impending retirement of the new incumbent or provision for "self-destruct" of the position itself. Four have positions which even skillfully written publicity releases make clear the universities intend to be temporary. Not only are the responsibilities of this group of administrators substantially different from those of the men with identical titles, but so also is their background, except in education.

Eight of the twelve hold undergraduate degrees from the Seven Sister Schools and nine have doctorates from the universities of the Ivy League. They do not have teaching or research experience comparable to that of men who become the presidents and provosts of the country's private, elite colleges and universities. However, more than half have had the lower echelon administrative experience their male counterparts lacked at the time of their appointment.

It is interesting to speculate on the probable professional future of these women, who because of new political forces have been elevated to

positions of visibility and responsibility in schools that two years ago scarcely acknowledged the existence of women in the academic. It appears that we may all be part of a grand accidental experiment which will test the question of whether the top administrative posts in American colleges and universities are to remain the final reward of the faculty member who has succeeded in the publish or perish system, and further whether the faculty of the elite schools will continue to accept academic leaders only from among their ranks. Certainly there is no evidence that keen intelligence, sensitivity in relationship, financial acumen, organizational ability or even insight into the nature of education and society, are limited to or even most likely to occur among teaching scholars. But it remains to be seen whether tradition-bound prestige institutions can be brought to test or objectively judge the performance of members of alternative populations for their highest positions. Positions of genuine authority in high level academic administration will have to be filled, by those who have served apprenticeships in lower echelon administration, and in other professions, before we will know whether such women (and men who come by this route) can bring new and different perspective and skills that will aid institutions in important ways.

Whether or not this comes about, many administrators will continue to come from the faculty. We must therefore increase not only the number of internship programs, or affirmative action plans that will remove barriers to the employment of women in lower echelon administration, but also the number of women in the regular tenured ranks of the faculty in the Ivy's and all of our schools. We must belatedly make it realistic for the most able female students of all ages, no less than their male peers, to aspire to and achieve normal progression on the academic ladder, including that last leap up to high academic administration for at least a few. To achieve this end there must be an enormous and fundamental change in institutional attitude and practice, not merely the appointment of officers of Equal Employment Opportunity or Committees on the Status of Women. Unless we who are the women already in higher administration can help bring this about, there will be neither substance nor permanence to the small gains in opportunities for women in administration that we have seen in the past twenty-four months.